

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFFREY SCOTT KLINEFELTER,
Plaintiff,
v.
GURMEET KAUR,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-01429-JAM-JDP (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND
DEFERRING CONSIDERATION OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

ECF Nos. 27, 31

Plaintiff has filed a motion for an extension of time to file a response to defendant's answer. ECF No. 27. A plaintiff is permitted to file a reply to an answer only when the court orders him to do so. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(C). Because the court has not ordered plaintiff to file a reply to defendant's answer, his motion for an extension of time, ECF No. 27, is denied.

Plaintiff has also filed a document requesting that summary judgment be entered against defendant. ECF No. 31. Rather than address this motion now, the court will refer this case to the Post-Screening Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") Project to allow the parties the opportunity to participate in a settlement conference.¹ If the case does not settle, the court will issue an order setting a briefing schedule for plaintiff's motion.


¹ The details regarding the referral to ADR are set forth in a concurrently filed order.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time, ECF No. 27, is denied.
2. The court defers consideration of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to administratively terminate ECF No. 31.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 22, 2021


JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE